

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Claim 1 is amended. No new matter is presented herein.

#### **Entry of Response Proper**

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as Claim 1 is amended to more clearly recite how the straight line is calculated, a feature already considered by the Examiner as evident in the instant Office Action (see page 3, 5-7); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 1-4 Recite Patentable Subject Matter**

Claim 1 is finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,615,760 to Vaks. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of judging the truth of a paper type including, among other steps, finding an equation of a straight line corresponding to a predetermined principal component, wherein the equation of the straight line is calculated through a sum of squares. The recited method facilitates the acceptable range being more accurately defined. Applicants respectfully submit Vaks does not teach or suggest such

a feature. As noted in the instant Office Action, Vaks discloses the equations  $P_1=M_1$ ;  $P_2=M_2$ ; and  $P_3=M_3$  in Figure 4 and  $P_1/(S_1*D_1)=M_1/(S_1*D_1)$ ;  $P_2/(S_2*D_2)=M_2/(S_2*D_2)$ ; and  $P_3/(S_3*D_3)=M_3/(S_3*D_3)$  in Figure 5 as representative of the equations for the straight lines shown therein.  $P_{1-3}$  represent a measured property of the currency, i.e., coin;  $M_{1-3}$  represent the statistical mean of the measured property  $P_{1-3}$ ;  $S_{1-3}$  represent a predetermined acceptance factor; and  $D_{1-3}$  represent a standard deviation of the measured property  $P_{1-3}$ .

As is clear from the above, Vaks does not teach or suggest finding an equation of a straight line corresponding to a predetermined principal component, wherein the equation of the straight line is calculated through a sum of squares. To establish *prima facie* obviousness, the applied art of record must teach or suggest each and every feature of a rejected claim. See M.P.E.P. §2143.04. As explained above, Vaks fails to teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the teachings of Vaks and should be deemed allowable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-4 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaks in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,419,423 to Ishida et al. (hereinafter "Ishida"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1, which is discussed above, and include each and every feature recited by Claim 1. Accordingly, the arguments for Claim 1, which are discussed above, also apply to Claim 2-4 for the instant rejection.

Vaks is discussed above.

Ishida discloses a paper money processor. Applicants have reviewed Ishida and are unable to locate any teaching or suggestion of a straight line being calculated using the sum of squares. Put simply, Ishida fails to overcome the above-described drawbacks of Vaks.

Applicants respectfully submit Vaks and Ishida, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the invention recited by Claims 2-4, as is required by M.P.E.P. §2143.03 to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the rejected claims. As such, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 2-4 are not rendered obvious by Vaks and Ishida should be deemed allowable at least for the same reasons Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-4, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 107314-00012.**

Respectfully submitted,  
**ARENT FOX PLLC**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MOZGU', is written over the printed name of the attorney.

Murat Ozgu  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

CMM:MO/elp